

Ser. No. 09/719,290
Response to Office Action of 5/26/04
Atty Docket 117210-27

- 5 -

REMARKS

Claim status

Claims 1-16 were pending in the application at the time of the current Office Action. All stand rejected as being obvious over prior art. Claims 1 is amended herein solely for the purpose of clarifying the claim. Claims 17-24 are added herein to define further aspects of the invention. Claims 1-24 are therefore currently pending in the application.

Section 102 rejections

There are no present rejections under Section 102.

Section 103 rejections

In the current Office action, claims 1-5, 10-14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grewe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,673), hereafter referred to as "Grewe '673", in view of Jones, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,974,334), hereafter referred to as "Jones '334".

In the current Office action, claims 6-9, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grewe '673 in view of Jones '334 and still further in view of Pardo (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,539) hereafter referred to as "Pardo '539".

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the above pending claims and for reasons set forth hereafter.

Independent claim 1 recites a portable computing, communication and entertainment device comprising a detachable handset unit sized for handheld grasping. The detachable handset unit includes a processor and a plurality of first circuits such that the processor controls the operation of the first circuits. The device also comprises a portable docking display unit dimensioned to receive docking of the detachable handset unit. The portable docking display unit includes a first display and a plurality of second circuits. The plurality of second circuits does not include a central processor. When the detachable handset unit is docked to the portable docking display unit, the processor of the detachable handset unit not only controls the first circuits of the detachable handset unit but also controls the operation of at least one of the second circuits and the first display of the portable docking display unit. In the claimed invention, the portable docking display unit can be a "dummy" unit that cannot operate unless the detachable handset unit is docked to the portable docking display

Ser. No. 09/719,290
Response to Office Action of 5/26/04
Atty Docket 117210-27

- 6 -

unit. The purpose of docking the detachable handset unit to the portable docking display unit is to extend the capability of the detachable handset unit to function more like a portable laptop computer, for example.

MPEP 2173.05(i) states, "The current view of the courts is that there is nothing inherently ambiguous or uncertain about a negative limitation. So long as the boundaries of the patent protection sought are set forth definitely, albeit negatively, the claim complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. ... Any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure."

The negative limitation in claim 1 "...said plurality of second circuits not including a central processor, ..." has basis in the disclosure in at least Fig. 3 which shows a portable docking display unit 30 and a detachable handset unit 20. The detachable handset unit 20 shows a central processor 11. However, the portable docking display unit 30 does not show a central processor. Also, the "Summary of the Invention" in the specification states, "For applications requiring larger display and keyboard, the detachable handset unit is docked into the main unit, the docking display unit. In this mode the detachable handset unit provides the processing and the communication power to the docking display unit." Furthermore, the "Preferred Embodiment for Carrying Out the Invention" in the specification states, "When mated with a docking display unit, the detachable handset unit becomes the controller for the entire portable computing, communication and entertainment device."

It is respectfully submitted that neither Grewe '673 nor Jones '334, nor the combination of the two teach or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, Grewe '673 and Jones '334 do not teach or suggest a detachable handset unit, having a processor, to control the operation of not only circuits within the detachable handset unit, but also to control the operation of at least one of a display of the portable docking display unit and circuits of the portable docking display unit when the handset unit is docked to the docking display unit such that the docking display unit does not have a central processor of its own, as does the claimed invention.

Instead, Grewe '673 describes interconnecting a PDA with some other accessory to enhance the PDA. (Abstract) For example, Grewe '673 describes mating a cellular telephone to a PDA simply to provide communication between the cellular telephone and the PDA. (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) The cellular telephone has its own processing capability and can be operated independently of the PDA. Likewise, the PDA has its own processing capability and can be operated independently of the cellular telephone. (column 1, lines 57-64) Grewe '673 does not teach or suggest, for example,

Ser. No. 09/719,290
Response to Office Action of 5/26/04
Atty Docket 117210-27

- 7 -

using a processor of the cellular telephone to control operation of any circuitry or display of the PDA. In the claimed invention, the processor of the handset unit is used to control the operation of at least one of a display of the portable docking display unit and circuits of the portable docking display unit. The claimed invention does not have a processor in the portable docking display unit as does each of the PDA and cellular telephone of Grewe '673. In the claimed invention, when the handset unit is docked to the portable docking display unit, the processor of the handset unit provides processing capability for the docking display unit. Similarly, none of the other embodiments described in Grewe '673 teach or suggest using a processor of a hand-held device to control parts of another device having a display, when docked.

Jones '334 describes a PDA having a multi-positional handset. The PDA has a base with a recessed handset cradle and a handset with a shape complementary to the configuration of the cradle. (column 3, lines 8-19) The handset docks to the PDA base simply to provide power to the handset (i.e., to charge a battery of the handset). (column 4, lines 11-30) Jones '334 does not teach or suggest using a processor of the handset to control the operation of any part of the PDA or vice versa. Jones '334 simply describes docking the handset to the PDA base in a flush configuration for mobile use, and in a non-flush configuration for office use.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 defines allowable subject matter. Since claims 2-15 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-15 define allowable subject matter as well.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner taking Official Notice that GPS is very well known in the art for monitoring the position of an object such that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include GPS in a handset that is capable of docking to and controlling the operation of a portable docking display unit. Applicant has argued above that the device of claim 1 is not obvious. Therefore, the device of claim 1 with GPS is not obvious. Since claim 16 depends indirectly from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 16 defines allowable subject matter.

With respect to new claims 17 - 24, claim 17 also defines the invention to comprise A communication and processing device with a portable handset for handheld grasping and manipulation of at least one input device provided thereon. The input device is coupled to a processor associated with the handset. the handset further includes a first display associated therewith. The device also comprises a docking display, to which the handset is selectively docked,. The docking


Ser. No. 09/719,290
Response to Office Action of 5/26/04
Atty Docket 117210-27

- 8 -

display has a second display which is larger than the first display, being controlled by the processor of the handset. The prior art of Grewe '673, Jones '334, either alone or in combination, simply do not teach or make obvious the invention as defined in claim 17. Specifically, Grewe '673 and Jones '334 do not teach or suggest a handset unit, having a processor, which is selectively docked with a docking display, and wherein the handset control the operation of the display when the handset unit is docked to the docking display unit. Further, the prior art does not provide a device wherein a handheld unit, the handset, can be docked with a docking display to effectively convert the handset to a laptop or tablet type of PC, with a larger display and auxiliary keyboard providing simpler and more effective use of the processing power of the handset. The dependent claims 18-24 also define clearly distinguishing characteristics of the present invention, which are neither shown nor made obvious by the prior art. It is believed the new claims 17 - 24 are also in allowable condition, and favorable action is requested.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments made above. After such reconsideration, it is urged that allowance of all claims will be in order.

Respectfully submitted,
Hahn Loeser + Parks, LLP



Scott M. Oldham
Registration No. 32,712

Twin Oaks Estate
1225 West Market Street
Akron, OH 44313-7188
(330) 864-5550
Fax 330-864-7986
smoldham@hahnlaw.com